

Christian Order

Property of
Graduate Theological Union

NOV 14 1988

September, 1988

The Editor

Laurence H. Lee

Peter Wilders

John Biggs-Davison, M.P.

Father Godfrey Carney

H. W. J. Edwards

TRAGEDY

DE PRO

WHAT'S

HONOUR TO GOD

WOMEN PRIESTS

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON METHODISM

MY BEST THANKS

to those who have renewed their subscriptions with such generosity during the summer months. May I ask the few who have not yet done so to renew without delay. This is very necessary now to keep our records straight.

—*Paul Crane, S.J.*

**CORPUS CHRISTI CHURCH,
MAIDEN LANE, STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

EVERY MONDAY

TRIDENTINE MASS AT 5.45 P.M.

Preceded by

ROSARY & BENEDICTION AT 5.15 P.M.

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page

386 TRAGEDY AT ECONE
The Editor

390 WOMEN PRIESTS
Fr. Godfrey Carney

400 SOME OBSERVATIONS
ON METHODISM
H. W. J. Edwards

407 DE PROFUNDIS
Lawrence H. Lee

413 ANGLICANS AND THE
TRIDENTINE RITE
Jeffrey G. Dorrance

418 HONOUR TO GOD
John Biggs-Davison, M.P.

422 THE CHURCH AND THE
PUBLIC GOOD
The Editor

429 CHRISTIAN ORDER: HOW
THE SYSTEM WORKS
Clency Mariapa

434 WHAT'S HAPPENED?
Peter Wilders

444 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.
Michael Macdonald

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and inclusive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£10, \$20
Australia—£12, \$25
New Zealand—£12, \$25

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 29

AUG./SEPT.

No. 8/9

Tragedy at Econe

THE EDITOR

I FOUND myself wondering as I read in *The Daily Telegraph* (11/7/88)!

"The battle for the hearts and minds of Archbishop Lefebvre's followers has opened in earnest with the Pope appointing a senior cardinal to seek ways to keep them within the mainstream Roman Catholic Church.

"Cardinal Paul Meyer a 77-year-old West German, will lead a Vatican Commission of eight Church experts who have the task of persuading the traditionalists to remain loyal to Rome, while making allowance for their 'spiritual and liturgical' needs".

There you have it. The lines apparently are drawn. With great respect, I would suggest that, in fact, they were drawn long ago; the gulf that now separates what we may call the New Church from the True saw its first beginnings as no more than a somewhat turbulent stream, when the New Mass was thrust on the Faithful, overnight as it were, in the immediate wake of the Second Vatican Council. The effect was traumatic where vast numbers of the Faithful were concerned. At one stroke, you might say, the lynchpin of their Faith was destroyed. This they sensed; knew to be so. They knew it within themselves without being able clearly to express it. Which is not to be wondered at.

The dearest things in life are loved beyond words. The whole of their Faith was in the Old Mass. This the Faithful knew. Now they see it as gone; not only from the New Mass, but everywhere within the Church. The New Mass in their eyes, valid though it is, where they are concerned — and increasingly in practice — is little more than a community gathering, protestantized to the point where it is increasingly man-centered; drifting away from God. And, with it, naturally enough, what practice there remains of the Catholic Faith drifts away as well. Over the years, doctrine has tended to follow suit. There is no need to enlarge on this point. It has been covered again and again in the pages of *Christian Order*. Small wonder that the split which came with the overnight imposition of the New Mass has widened beyond words into the abyss which today divides the Old Church from the New, as it divided originally the Old Mass from the New.

Working on that original rupture, which was largely their own creation, the neo-Modernist Establishment, from its position of power at all levels within the Church, has worked away at its task of diverting the Church's doctrinal and evangelizing thrust to suit no more than man's momentary needs, as distinct from holding out to him the eternal truths of God. Those in opposition to this trend, who stand by the Faith of their Fathers, have been, in so many cases I know of, rebuffed, marginalized, isolated. The marvel is that they now stand at all. The onslaught on all they hold dear has, in so many cases, been pitiless in its insensitivity. Does Rome know anything of this — the plight of its marooned Faithful? If it does, I have to say with respect that, in practice, it appears to so many, not only as having done nothing about it; but as incapable now of doing anything in the future to save what is an increasingly desperate situation. The hungry sheep are not merely not being fed; they are being left to die; and, with them, the Faith they have refused to surrender to the predators within the Church they love, who are busier now than ever shredding that Faith to pieces.

I am not a Lefebvrist. I never have been. But I can understand completely why so many have turned to him. It is simply because they find once more within Archbishop

Lefebvre's Society of St. Pius XI and its ministrations — above all, the Old Mass — everything that has been taken from them in the wake of the Council and in the name of that which was claimed so fraudently to be within its spirit. Now, most tragically, the break has come. I regret it more deeply than I can say; but, without excusing it, I do understand it. In what way? Simply this. For more than twenty years now, as it appears, High Authority in the Church has received complaint after complaint from faithful Catholics shocked at what is going on in the Church they love. And what has come of their complaints? So far as they can see, nothing; absolutely nothing at all. In the eyes of so many, Church Authority has stripped itself of credibility in their eyes. There have been words. There have been no deeds. They have found and still find themselves with nowhere to go. I am in no way surprised that, under these sad circumstances, so many have taken the road to Ecône. I do not commend them for doing it; but I do understand why they have done it. Sheep without a shepherd; "Lord to whom shall we go"? As has appeared so tragically to so many, there was only one road left and they took it. Now Rome, as it seems to them, has blocked that road. They stand up-ended. One might ask the question; Who, in the last analysis, is responsible not only for the tragedy that has brought schism to the Catholic Church, but for the countless thousands of broken-hearted Catholics who have never taken the road to Ecône, but whose lives have been shattered by the neo-Modernist wave that has engulfed the Church and deprived them of the Mass they prized and loved beyond anything they had on this earth.

Let us realize straightforwardly, but with no rancour or bitterness, the reason why the Church is beset with the disintegration that has brought sadness and sorrow to so many. It is so beset because it is beset with neo-Modernism and the reason for this can only be the failure, in practice, of the Church's Bishops, priests and religious to stand firm in the face of neo-Modernist attack; defending the Faith and confounding its enemies. This they have not done. This is a fact. Those who have watched, with mounting sorrow and frustration, the progressive ruination of the Catholic Church at the hands of its neo-Modernist enemies know

that this is so. The Faithful have been betrayed by their Pastors. If the Faithful are to be brought back, whether they are in the family of Econe or outside it, and peace restored to the Church once more, there is one thing that has to be done by way of a beginning. The Old Mass must be restored to the whole Church now, unconditionally and, at least, on a basis of parity of esteem with the New. The Holy Father must do this and Bishops and Religious Superiors be placed under the most severe injunction to see that this is done. There is no other way. With all respect, at this twenty-fourth hour it is not experts who are needed to rescue the Church from disaster. What is needed is courage. Under God, no more and no less than that.

SPOT THE DIFFERENCE : 1

(From the Apostolic Letter of John Paul II—*Osservatore Romano*—11/7/88)

6. Taking account of the importance and complexity of the problems referred to in this document, by virtue of my Apostolic Authority I decree the following :

a) a *Commission* is instituted whose task it will be to collaborate with the bishops, with the Departments of the Roman Curia and with the circles concerned, for the purpose of facilitating full ecclesial communion of priests, seminarians, religious communities or individuals until now linked in various ways to the Fraternity founded by Mons. Lefebvre, who may wish to remain united to the Successor of Peter in the Catholic Church, while preserving their spiritual and liturgical traditions, in the light of the Protocol signed on 5 May last by Cardinal Ratzinger and Mons. Lefebvre;

Turn to last page for unofficial translation as published in "Briefings".

We are publishing this Address given at the Westminster Cathedral Centre before a Pro Fide audience, not only because of its intrinsic value; but because of its timeliness in the light of the pressure in favour of women priests, stepped up within the Anglican Church, and given expression at the Church's Synod last July.

Women Priests

FATHER GODFREY CARNEY

ABOUT twenty years ago, a bishop told me a joke which at the time I thought quite clever and also quite funny. He said, "At the next General Council the bishops will be allowed to take their wives, and at the next Council after that, the bishops will be allowed to take their husbands". I still think it clever, but I don't think it's so funny any more. The thing has gone beyond a joke.

It was funny to me because it seemed so outrageously far fetched and unheard of, that the idea of women priests should ever be taken seriously. This was not because I had ever thought that women were in any way inferior to men. Far from it. No, the reason was that, when I was taught in the seminary, I knew and all of us knew, that ordination was given only to a person of the male sex who was baptised, as the Canon Law said, and still says. I do not remember that we were ever told anything more about it in our theological lectures. We took it as read.

The Male Priesthood not from the Church, but from Christ

It is only now, when the question has become controversial, that I find that it has been written about here and there throughout Church history. In the first century of Christianity, the Gnostic heretics tried to introduce "priestesses". This was condemned very strongly by St. Irenaeus, by Tertullian, Firmilian, Origen, and St. Epiphanius and others. The idea of the "men only" priesthood was upheld by St. John Chrysostom, and later on by many professors of

theology in the Middle Ages. There is a much quoted letter of Pope Innocent III (1210) in which he says, "Although and Blessed Virgin Mary was of higher dignity and excellence than all the Apostles, it was to them, not to her, that the Lord entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven". St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Richard of Middleton and other illustrious names, could be added to the list of theologians who, all through, have made the necessity of a male priesthood such a strong tradition. It is remarkable how so often they seem to anticipate the modern arguments for feminine ordination. For example, Duns Scotus says, "It must not be considered to have been determined by the Church. It comes from Christ. The Church would not have presumed to deprive the female sex, for no fault of their own, of an act that might licitly have pertained to it". Durandus, another theologian of that time, said, "The male sex is of necessity for the sacrament. The principle cause of this is Christ's institution. Christ ordained only men, not even His Mother. It must therefore be held that women cannot be ordained because of Christ's institution". In subsequent centuries all Catholic theologians have noted this as something decided by the Church as of divine origin. That, I suppose, is why we all took it for granted until recent decades. No one had attempted to ordain women since the Gnostics in the first century. No breakway sect, as far as I can discover, even most freakish, had ever tried it, all through the ages. Not until 1958, when the Lutherans in Sweden began to make women ministers of religion. From there it spread to other Protestant bodies. In the Anglican Communion women began to be ordained first in Hong Kong in 1971, in the United States 1974, in Canada 1975, and in England itself controversy on the matter has gone on with pronounced intensity, as we know. A few weeks ago the Archbishop of Canterbury, on TV, was accepting that it was only a matter of time before the change came here also.

Effect on the Catholic Body

What effect has all this had on the Catholic body? Only a fortnight ago I read in the *Universe* that an English Catholic bishop looked forward to a Third Vatican Council

in which Eastern Orthodox bishops, and Anglican bishops, would take part, and in which the question of women priests would be decided. Where he got these prophetic powers from, and why he should think that the Catholic Church has not already decided against the idea, I find it impossible to say.

It is all too clear that, just as in many other matters, in spite of many statements made by Rome against it, there is still a vocal minority in favour of it, among theologians, lay people, religious, priests, even bishops, especially in America.

Recent Official Catholic Statements

Let us see what the Official Catholic Church has said about it in these recent years. It has made at least six statements. Pope Paul VI (18th April, 1975), addressing a meeting on the role of women in the Church said: "Although women do not receive the call to the Apostolate of the twelve (i.e. the Apostles), and therefore to the ordained ministries, they are nonetheless invited to follow Christ as disciples and co-workers. We cannot change what Our Lord did, nor His call to women".

In November, 1975, Pope Pius VI wrote to Dr. Coggan of Canterbury an answering letter, in which he said: "Your Grace is of course aware of the Catholic Church's position on this question. She holds that it is not admissible to ordain women for very fundamental reasons. These reasons include—the example recorded in the Sacred Scriptures of Christ choosing His Apostles only from among men, the constant practice of the Church which has initiated Christ in choosing only men, and her living Teaching Authority has consistently held that the exclusion of women from the priesthood is in accordance with God's Plan for His Church. We must regretfully recognise that the new course taken by the Anglican Communion in admitting women to the ordained priesthood cannot fail to introduce into this dialogue an element of great difficulty". On 23rd March, 1976, in another letter to Dr. Coggan, he called the new move in the Church of England "a grave new obstacle and

a threat on the path". (That is, the path of re-union of Christians.)

Our present Pope John Paul II wrote to Archbishop Runice (20th December, 1984), re-affirming what Pope Paul VI had written, and saying that the increasing practice of ordaining women in the Anglican Church is, in the eyes of the Catholic Church, "an increasingly serious obstacle to unity".

On 18th December, 1985, Cardinal Willibrands, President of the Vatican Secretariat for Christian Unity, wrote a long letter to Dr. Runcie replying to his arguments in favour of women priests.

Clearing Misunderstandings

I would like now to clear away some misunderstandings. Firstly, this is not a social problem. The fact that women are rising now to the highest positions in the State, in politics, industry, law, medicine, etc. has nothing to do with the priesthood. In other areas in the Church there is strong encouragement given to women nowadays, but not the priesthood. The Church is of a different order than the State. This is not a social question, a matter of social discrimination against women. It is not at all a social question. It is a purely *theological* question. It's true that some of the early writers did use arguments which implied that women were inferior to men. No one could use this approach now, and those old writers *did* use the right reasons as well as the wrong reasons. If it were a social injustice it would have been put right long ago. It is not a human *right* for *all*. No one, man or woman, has a *right* to ordination. "You have not chosen Me. I have chosen You". A vocation is not an inner feeling, attraction by itself. It must be authenticated by a call *from the Church*. The Church's deep reverence for womankind has always been evident in history. We see it in the great honour given to women saints and martyrs, and the outstanding devotion given to our Mother Mary, and in many other ways, to quote *Insigniores*: "The greatest in the Kingdom are not the ministers, but the saints".

The people who insist on making this an affair of human rights, sexism, and so on, will have us believe that Our

Lord chose men in order to go along with the prejudices of His day. There is nothing to support this argument, and against it we have to note that Our Lord was remarkably unconventional about many things. He shocked the Pharisees and His Own Apostles by many of the irregular things He did in regard to Sabbath rules, and indeed in His attitude to women. He made women the first witnesses of His resurrection from the dead. So there is no evidence whatever that His choice of men for the priesthood was influenced by social factors, and there *is* in fact evidence *against* that view.

"Priest" and "Minister" Mean Different Things

Another thing we must clear up in our minds is this — the word "priest" and the word "minister" mean two different things. The Protestant Reformers rejected the Mass as a sacrifice. Therefore they rejected the priesthood, because a priest is primarily a man who offers sacrifice. Therefore, for the Protestants of today, the person who is appointed to preside over their assemblies, and over what for them is only a holy meal that recalls the Last Supper, that person can be a man or a woman. It is a matter of little importance which sex they belong to. That person has received no special Sacrament. Why then is there a row about this in the Church of England? Because in that comprehensive body there is a whole spectrum of belief from 90 per cent to almost zero. The High Church section have held on to the notion of bishops and Orders, and in latter times have tried to regain the priesthood and the Eucharist, even as a *sacrifice* of some sort. Some High Church people are completely opposed to women priests for the same kind of reasons for which we are opposed to them, but I think the majority are vaguely unconcerned. Hence the quarrel and disagreement which may end in schism, or confused compromise.

Priesthood and that of the Laity

A third thing which needs clarification is the meaning of the "Priesthood of the Laity" and how the priest's priesthood differs from it. By Baptism a Catholic becomes a

member of Christ's Church, a member of Christ's Mystical Body. He or she shares in the priesthood of Christ in the sense that they have the right and the duty to take part in the Mass and offer themselves united to Christ in the Act of the Cross which continues in the Mass. Also they share in Christ's priesthood by receiving the Sacraments, by prayer and thanksgiving, by the witness of a holy life, by self-denial and active charity. In a neat formula, they put their lives into Christ's Sacrifice, the Mass, and they try to put Christ's Sacrifice, the Mass, into their daily lives. Now the priest has a different kind of priesthood. He has received another Sacrament — Holy Orders — by which he, in the very Person of Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, makes the Sacrifice of the Cross present on the altar.

Teaching of the Church on Women Priests

What then is the teaching of the Catholic Church on women priests? The Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, acting on a mandate given it by the Holy Father and echoing the declaration the Pope made on 30th November, 1975, declares that the Church *does not consider herself authorised* to admit women to priestly ordination. Firstly because this has been the *constant tradition* of the Church, both East and West, all through its history from the very beginning. Secondly, *the attitude of Christ*, who ordained only men (the Twelve Apostles) although His attitude towards women often broke the rigid customs of the people among whom He lived. Thirdly, *the practice of the Apostles*. Mary the Mother of Christ had a privileged place with them, but to fill the place of Judas among the Twelve they chose a man — Matthias. On the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit filled them all, men and women. But the Proclamation of Christ as Saviour was made by "Peter and the Eleven".

The Apostles *continued in the same pattern* as the Church spread to other countries. The men apostles represented the man Jesus who had made them teachers in His name to all nations. The women were their highly valued co-workers, but they ordained only men by "the laying on of hands". In this they imitated Christ, and the Church has been faithful to Christ's example ever since.

Fourthly, *the living teaching authority of the Church*, which consistently held that, in this matter, she is acting in accordance with God's Plan for His Church.

There is such a finality about that constant attitude of Christ's Infallible Church, that it is perfectly clear that she can never contradict it. She is *not authorised* to do so. She cannot do so. Therefore for Catholics that must be the unchangeable Faith. "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*"—"That which has been held *always, everywhere, and by all*". That ancient criterion seems very relevant here. In the face of two thousand years of solid belief and unchanging practice, I do not think there is any need for the Church to make a solemn definition about this. Scripture and Tradition together speak loudly enough.

In Accord with God's Plan for His Church

Before I finish, I must try to indicate what the Pope meant by saying that "the Church has consistently held that, in this matter, she is acting in accordance with the teaching of God's Plan for His Church". What is God's Plan for His Church in regard to the ministerial priesthood? The key word to this is the word "Covenant". God offering salvation, a share of His own Divine Life to man and woman — that is the Covenant. This Plan is expressed throughout the Bible, Old and New, as a Nuptial theme. In the Old Testament God looks on His chosen people as a much loved spouse. He is the faithful Bridegroom, Israel is the not always faithful Bride. This sexual theme is carried over into the New Testament. The Incarnation is a marriage between God and Man, between Christ the Bridegroom, and the Church, His Bride, whom He loves because He had laid down his life for her in the New and Everlasting Covenant of the shredding of His Blood, and made Her glorious, holy, without blemish. The marriage of man and woman is a great Sacrament because it is a Symbol of this. The man represents Christ the Bridegroom. The woman represents the Church, the Bride of Christ. Eve was formed from Adam's rib, and the Church and the Sacraments that save, flowed from the pierced side of Christ, the New Adam on the Cross.

Listen for a moment to St. John Chrysostom, that great Father of the early Church: "There came out from His side water and blood. Dearly beloved, do not pass by the secret of this great mystery without reflection. For I have another secret mystical interpretation to give. I said that Baptism and the mysteries were symbolised in that blood and water. It is from these two that the Holy Church has been born, "by the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit, by baptism and by the mysteries (the "mysteries" here means the Mass and the other Sacraments). Now the symbols of baptism and the mysteries, came from His side. It was from His side then, that Christ formed the Church, as from the side of Adam He formed Eve. That is why in his account of the first man, Moses has the words — 'bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh', giving us a hint here of the Master's side. For us, at that time, God took a rib and formed woman. So Christ gave us blood and water from His side and formed the Church. Just as then He took the rib while Adam was in a deep sleep, so now He gave the blood and water after His death. Have you seen how Christ has united His Bride to Himself? Have you seen with what kind of food He feeds us all?"

Only a Man can Take the Role of Christ in the Mass

Because of this strong sexual symbolism which pervades God's Plan for us, we must never ignore the fact that (1) Christ is, and remains a man, and (2) that in the Mass Christ offers Himself the author of the New and Everlasting Covenant, the Head of the Church, the new Adam, the Bridegroom, therefore (3) in the Mass His role must be taken by a man.

That word "role". What does it mean? It originates in the theatre. When we say that the priest at the altar acts in the *Person* of Christ we mean that He acts the role, the part of Christ, as in a play. The word "person" comes from the Greek and Roman theatre. The actors each wore a mask. The mouth of the mask was shaped rather like a megaphone so that the sound would travel to all the audience. "*Sona*" in Latin means "sounds". "*Personare*"

means to "sound through". Hence the word "person". The mask pictured the character that was being presented. From this, the list of characters in the play was "*Dramatis personae*", "the persons in the play". The modern theatre does not use masks. The actors do their best to present the character, to identify with the character, to "put on the person" of the character. I am not thinking of pantomimes of course, where the "Principal Boy" is often a woman, and "The Dame" is often a man. That adds to the fun. In serious plays—dramas—that is not done. In a serious play a woman playing a man's part would hardly be a success, neither would a man playing a woman's part. In the Passion Play at Oberammergau, a woman could hardly want to play the part of Christ. Pope Paul VI once said, "In an opera, the soprano is of supreme importance, but she is not the tenor".

Now the Mass is truly a great drama. But it is much more than a drama. It is the Thing itself, the *Action* of Christ Himself, giving Himself perpetually in the Sacrifice of the Cross. The action of Christ is a hidden action brought about by Christ through the hidden character stamped on the soul of the priest by ordination. That action is known by Faith. But it is also a Sign. We must see and hear the Sign with our eyes and ears. The Sign is seen in the Sacred species, the appearances of bread and wine. But the priest whose hands hold up in a gesture of sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ, whose voice speaks the mighty words of Consecration, the words of Christ — the priest is essentially a part of the Sign. He acts not just as a *representative* of Christ, but as a sacramental *representation* of Christ, the very *image* of Christ, the New Adam giving Himself for the New Eve which is the Church.

Words from the Archbishop of Dublin

The new Archbishop of Dublin, Desmond Connell, is a very learned philosopher, and a truly Catholic Archbishop. I believe this because the day after he was made Archbishop, the Vatican newspaper published an article by him about women priests which is very profound and which has helped me to prepare this effort for you. I can't do better than finish now with a quotation from that article: "I do

not say that a woman cannot represent Christ. Every baptised person, man or woman, is "Alter Christus"—another Christ. What I do say, however, is that a woman cannot be the sacramental image of Christ in the act that is proper to Him precisely as the New Adam. The symbolism of the New Adam and the New Eve expresses the relation between Christ and the Church, which is profoundly involved in the Eucharistic celebration.

Now the distinction between Adam and Eve is the sexual difference between man and woman, the primordial distinction universally present wherever human beings are to be found".

Women Symbolic of Interiority

In short, he is saying that a woman cannot be a priest for the same reason that the Bride cannot be the Bridegroom or that Eve cannot be Adam. But the Archbishop also says, and, as a boost to the ladies, I pass the gist of it on to you; he says that, in the essential comparison of the sexes, woman is not only not inferior to man, she is *superior* to him. Man stands for what is exterior, efficient, transient, passing. Woman is symbolic of interiority, dwelling, home, the purpose of human existence, the possibility of being at home in the world, close to the mystery of life.

A world dominated with technology loses its sense of interior being. It attacks nature. That's what we mean when we speak of the rape of the environment. Its greatest perversion perhaps is the estrangement of the woman who, accepting its exteriority and efficiency as her ideals, forgets her femininity and wants not just to be equal to man, but to be indistinguishable from him. The substitution of test tubes and incubators for the womb would be the final achievement of this tendency. Deprived of the interiority symbolised by woman, our being in the world, is rootless, centreless, without depth, dwelling, purpose, heart — empty.

Creation has nothing more eloquent of its mystery than a woman's love. In this love we glimpse a strength greater than the strength that transforms the world, because love is the strength that *created* it, the strength that *maintains* it, the strength that *guides* it towards its end.

H. W. J. Edwards writes perceptively — yet with generous understanding — of Methodism's contribution to religion in England and Wales. He laments its present sad decline; the dead-sea fruit, as he sees it, of what he calls "the gaucherie of the Christian Social Gospel".

Some Observations on Methodism

(250th Anniversary)

H. W. J. EDWARDS

Two Earthquakes

IT is perhaps too much to say that John Wesley startled many into Methodism by reading his sermon text: "Though the earth be moved, the God of Jacob is our refuge". He preached that sermon in the Foundry Chapel in February, 1750. By a coincidence London was at once shaken by an earthquake. Thousands fled into the open spaces and were stirred by a fanatic who prophesied the end of the world.

Exactly a month later, London was again shaken by an earthquake. The two events were vividly described by Hume, who, as a characteristic 18th-century sceptic, sneered at the "enthusiasts" — the Methodists. I write from memory, but I believe that Dr. Johnson was on their side. I suspect that he may have had a political reason, among others, for so being. He was a High Tory. John Byrom, tutor to the two Wesleys, John and Charles, was not only a High Tory but had been implicated in the Jacobite Movement.

The Wesleys and High Toryism

We are hard put to thinking of the Wesleys as also High Tories. But that they were. Moreover John Wesley was

greatly influenced by another High Tory, William Law, whose *Serious Call* made a very deep impression upon him. This High Toryism was almost a reflection of the Laudian school of Anglicanism, more clearly evident in the several eucharistic hymns of Charles. Indeed, about 1870 a publisher for the extreme High Church school published several of Charles Wesley's "Hymns on the Lord's Supper". A Dr. Rigg in *The London Quarterly* attempted with some success to assert that such hymns belonged to Charles Wesley's earlier period — before the same sort of mysterious awakening which shook his brother. It was even asserted in 1872 that Charles Wesley adopted a Presbyterian theology. This is going very much too far.

In using the word Tory I in no way intend to refer to present party politics. I use it in the archaic sense of those people, mostly High Anglicans, in the late 17th and early 18th centuries who combined a high regard for monarchy, especially as we see it among the Stuarts, with a tendency to such churchmanship as advocated by Laud, Jeremy Collier, Bishop Ken, and others who were accused by the Puritans of attempting by bring back Popery. Some of these Tories were radical dissenters such as William Penn and Robert Barclay — I refer to their support for the Stuarts not their theology.

As a boy, I became mildly interested in the Wesleys through reading a monthly periodical entitled *The Arminian* at the house of a strongly Calvinist uncle, a man generous enough to have Methodist friends. At school (under Anglican auspices) I came to know something of the controversy between the Arminians and the Calvinists; and I found that the Laudian school in the Anglican body was considered Arminian. It may, then, very well be that both John and Charles did not by any means decline from this Anglicanism. Fletcher of Madeley, a very close friend of John Wesley, who remained in the wild parish, was actually a refugee from Calvinist Geneva. He was not wrongly dubbed a Methodist.

When John Wesley was undergoing great persecution while going from strength to strength, a booklet arrived: *An Old Fox Tarred and Feathered*. In it the author called John Wesley "a low and puny Tadpole". In later writ-

ings this same author wrote that "his satanic guilt was only exceeded by his satanic shamelessness" and that he was "the most rancorous hater of the Gospel system that ever appeared in this Island". It says much for the Wesleys that they made use of his famous hymn, "Rock of Ages". Of course, men were by no means mealy-mouthed in those days; and perhaps Catholics may discern in such polemical invective something close to the stir when St. Augustine clashed with Pelagius, not, of course, that the Arminians were pelagian, though Calvinists have insisted that they themselves take the same line as Augustine.

Calvinistic Methodists

The possibly greater preacher than John Wesley was the Calvinistic Methodist, Whitefield, whose voice could be heard at a great distance. In Wales the Calvinistic school made the bigger impact through Daniel Rowlands, William Williams and Howel Davies. William Williams (Pantycelyn) sang Wales into the revival with hymns as copious as Charles Wesley's. What I may call Wesleyan Methodism had some success in Anglesey and north-east Wales. Though Whitefield preached in Cornwall, it was the Wesleyan brand that worked wonders there. To this day Methodism has been potent in Cornwall and in parts of Wessex. This is the explanation for the advent in the 19th century of Methodism in Glamorgan and Gwent whence it came to the coal mining valleys from Cornwall, Bristol and the Forest of Dean. Until a few years ago in Tonypandy there stood the large Central Hall, a term given to certain Methodist places. It was replaced by a supermarket.

Methodists and Political Parties

Two prominent members of Tonypandy Central Hall were the late Annie Powell, for many years a Communist councillor on the Rhondda Borough Council, and Lord Tonypandy—George Thomas to most Rhondda folk. He held very firmly to the notion that the Labour Party was greatly influenced by Methodism. This he first asserted

in 1948 when the Labour Party published a centenary edition of the Communist Manifesto. No doubt the Methodist Lord Soper would probably like to say much the same about Methodism and the Labour Party. In the 19th century a radical Methodism was associated with the Liberal Party especially in Cornwall and the north of England. In the era when the Methodist sect was subdivided into Wesleyan Methodists, United Methodists, Primitive Methodists and the "Billy Bray" Bible Christians of parts of Cornwall, there was a strong tendency of the Wesleyan Methodists to Conservatism though not Toryism. I remember, when in the English army, noticing that a Wesleyan chapel in Kent used the Anglican service once a month.

Among Calvinistic Methodists there were real Tories like that Angel of Judgement, John Elias. That extraordinary preacher, the late Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, whom I knew well, was most conservative — his last lecture in Welsh was upon the theology and sanctity of St. Thomas Aquinas. But the Calvinistic Methodists are now generally known as Welsh Presbyterians. Some of them have merged with other Evangelicals to form a neo-evangelical movement, fundamentalist but not necessarily Calvinist, both in Wales and in other parts of the Kingdom. As for others of the Wesleyan tradition, I think of the urbane Nathaniel Micklem who parodied the Modernists with a version of the hymn, "Just as I Am". It read :

Just as I am, and not like those
Who tell their sorrows and their woes;
We turn our tails up, not our toes;
Hop, skip and jump we come.

The Secret of Methodism in its Hymns

On the other hand, from the beginning Methodism gave a certain cheerful approach. Indeed, Charles Wesley was so intent upon it that, after seeing a dead woman in Cardiff, he wrote a stuffed-owl hymn beginning, "O Beautiful Appearance of Death!". It was soon excised. Another hymn, "Sovereign of All, Whose Will Ordains", composed in 1744, set out the doctrine of the divine right of Kings. That, no doubt, would hardly be highly regarded either by

Conservatives or Socialists. But, after all, we may well judge Methodism by its hymns. Following Fletcher of Saltoun, who asserted that he did not worry who made the laws so long as the songs were right, I am sure that the secret of Methodism is in its hymns. Gladness, delight, a certain wistfulness (especially in hymns derived from German sources), and "assurance" are very evident.

"Assurance" the Mark of Methodism

This last is, perhaps, the chief mark of Methodism. It is not quite the same as the Lutheran leap in the dark. It derived, I believe, from John Wesley's association with the Moravians and it seems to have not a little to do with John Wesley's insistence upon Christian perfection — what Toplady appeared to be attacking in his very "Rock of Ages". At first, the Wesleys were thought to be Jesuits. John Wesley's correspondence with St. Alphonsus might give rumour. He held in high regard *The Imitation of Christ*: but, then, the Calvinist, John Newton, was changed by reading it when a slave trader. Catholics may well see in Wesley's concern for what we call an increase in Sanctifying Grace what belongs to the Faith. We jib at the doctrine of assurance, as he proclaimed it, but Wesley broke decisively with the Moravians. Charles Wesley wrote a hymn in reprobation of their errors concerning contrition and John wrote another, in which he condemned their quietism — "While Satan Cries, be Still". At the Council of Trent it was conceded that a soul might very well have a moral assurance; and, indeed, were we to trouble ourselves at a given time about whether we should receive the Blessed Sacrament, we should be torn by scruples. The shadow of Jansenism still lurks.

Uncovenanted Graces

Ever since the usually superficial Macaulay made the percipient observation about the Wesleys by comparing them with the Franciscans, we have been more than ready to concede that they may well have received uncovenanted graces. Despite much we may call fanaticism — "God save the Church of England and no enthusiasm!" — and

much in the way of backsliding, especially among "leaders", Methodism has altered much of these Isles and elsewhere. If it be said that Methodists, especially of the Wesleyan rather than the Calvinist School, relied much upon "feeling", we should be careful to distinguish between Pascal's reasons of the heart and mere feeling. The Wesleys are commonly said to have taken a part in the reaction against a dry rationalism, a reaction which may suggest to us many a name: Walter Scott, Burke, de Maistre, Coleridge, Chateaubriand, Newman, yes, even the young Disraeli, aware of what he called "passion". Outside Holy Church such a movement might well fall into error: indeed, nowadays, where not so dissimilar movements are taking place within it, there seems to be peril. A Catholic Church without "bowels" is, however, abhorrent.

Decline in Recent Years

Not at all for us to ignore is the circumstance that, during the Methodist Movement's beginnings, devotion to the Sacred Heart greatly increased among us. Similarly, in 1858 there was a strange increase in piety in Ireland: it was followed by the great Welsh Revival under Methodist auspices a year later. But we must concede that Methodism has greatly declined in recent years. I believe that that offshoot of Methodism, the Salvation Army, has also declined. I hazard one cause. One of the most evident aspects of Methodism was the Agape, the Love Feast. "Come up into the Chariot of Love", wrote Charles Wesley, a hymn that began, "Come, let us ascend". Fletcher of Madeley, sometimes called the seraphic, wrote: "When the triumphal chariot of perfect love gloriously carries you to the top of perfection's hill; when you are almost translated like Elias, then you may sing this hymn".

From Immoderate "Verticalism" to Overstretched "Horizontalism"

It was this extreme "verticalism" which marked Methodism in its first years and even later. Charles Wesley's famous hymn, "Love Divine, All Loves Excelling" is commonly sung at weddings. But that was not the original

intention : it was a hymn for Pentecost. It may be that there is a tension between *Agape* and *Eros*. (Welsh has the two words for Love, *Cariad* and *Serch*, though some poet, possibly of the baroque, might carefully confuse them). What, alas, has come about is a false movement from an immoderate verticalism to a mood which see Charity as the Commissioners see it. As to that, I asked several excellent Catholics what would happen if a parish had some secret benefactor who provided it with so much cash that there would be no need for the weekly pools, the occasional bazaars et cetera. They were appalled at the prospect. They would have practically nothing to do. I suggested they might take a leaf out of the book of St. Joseph Sharbel, whose life I described. The very idea !

The Gaucherie of the Christian Social Doctrine

But this has undoubtedly to do with Methodism's decline. It has become influenced by the *gaucherie* of the Christian Social Gospel, which I have in my visits to London years ago heard expounded by Lord Soper in Hyde Park. If the Gospel is a prop, a very good prop, to social order, and no more, it is nothing worth. We could well do without it. In my senility I mind two great Methodists, alive when I was a child, the Revs. Mark Guy Pearse and Hugh Price-Hughes. It was, I believe, said that the former would preach to the saints and the latter to the sinners in Westminster Central Hall, where the Rev. Sangster exercised a great work several decades ago. My father knew them well. He commented that the former had his gaze fixed to paradise while the latter campaigned for practical affairs. I suspect that Methodism has lost awhile the former's mission.

AUTHORS : Your book published inc. Poems, Religious, Autobiographical subjects and Fiction. For details: "C.O." Excalibur Press, 1 Elystan Place, London, SW3, 3LA.

Written by one whose love of the True Church is deep and respect for the Holy Father profound, this article expresses better than any I have come across, the frustration bordering on near-despair, which fills the hearts of so many true Catholics today. The writer is not a citizen of this country; neither does he reside here in the United Kingdom. It is important to notice that his article was written a year ago, in mid-1987, and not with the recent tragic events at Econe in mind. It is the more powerful for that. The divide within the Church to which it refers is that between neo-Modernism and its protagonists, who are many, and those Catholics who hold fast to the traditional teaching of the Church they love. The Author of this article is one of these latter.

De Profundis

LAWRENCE H. LEE

Words and Actions

POPE John Paul II's athletic prowess on the mountain side and in the snow is a matter of record. Without prejudice to the reverence reserved for Christ's Vicar, it must be acknowledged that both the secular and the Catholic media have triumphantly presented us with the image of a nimble-footed mountaineer in the arena of church politics. The picture brings to mind with agonising accuracy the amazing dexterity with which His Holiness copes with the yawning abyss which separates the New Church from his True Church. Surely it is with preternatural versatility that the Sovereign Pontiff skips from side to side of this ever-widening chasm dividing the New Church from the True. No matter how impossible it may appear to bridge the gap, John Paul II can still do it. He cannot do it forever.

Words and Actions

It is of the greatest importance to recognise the difference between words — both written and spoken — and actions. One minute Pope John Paul appears as over on the side of the New Church, consorting, so to speak, with the mockers and rockers. The next minute, with that preternatural dexterity so incomprehensible to mere mortals, the Faithful Shepherd crosses the cavernous abyss to proclaim Eternal Truths and issue Divine Commands. This latter manoeuvre provides believers in the Truth with the Divine Consolation that Christ, Our Beloved Redeemer, still inevitably honours his timeless Promise, “Behold I am with you all days until the consummation of the world”.

We must surely thank the Holy Angels with all our hearts for safely bringing Our Holy Father in Christ back to us across the gaping chasm. Whatever preternatural force draws him to the mockers and the scoffers I do not know. What I do know is that the implications of this scenario are charged with eternal, everlasting consequences for countless millions. There must be a moment when we must hear Our Lord’s voice loudly and unmistakably warning, not only that such an abyss can *BE*, but also that it *cannot be bridged*. No matter how ready Lazarus was to bring solace to his friend, he was not permitted to do so.

None are so blind as those who do not wish to see; that have eyes and see not. Why this blindness among the Lord’s anointed? The servant is not greater than the master. The devil is renowned for taking even Our Divine Lord himself to high places from which it was possible to encompass the whole world. From such heights no earthly divisions may be visible to the naked human eye. Perhaps the schisms are hidden from John Paul II in this way. The servant is no greater than the Master and the Master was tempted. But Jesus saw the Truth because He was the Truth. *Usquequo, Domine, usquequo*, how long, O Lord how long must we endure, torn asunder upon the rack while tonsured heads are buried in the sand or lifted in proud but silly defiance. “I will not serve” is the primeval act of attempted human fulfilment.

A Soul in Torment?

When we see the face of the Vicar of Christ on earth,

John Paul II, we no longer read the agony of a wounded body, but rather, the pain of a soul in torment. Perhaps the Mother of Sorrows on Calvary knew that torment. She knew that *few* would pay any attention to the Sacrifice of Redemption for the whole of the human race which she, for all her gentle humility, was called to witness, to consent to and accept on behalf of all mankind. No matter how many spared a glance or lingered to look at the pitiful body of her Son on the Cross, few would care about the Redemption being accomplished by that vicarious sacrifice of the God-made-man. Maybe the vision of their indifference and rejection is a vision His Holiness cannot yet endure. When we pray — and we pray many times a day for the Vicar of Christ, Our Shepherd — we pray the Holy Angels will bring him safely back across the abyss no matter how often a false zeal for souls will tempt him to go along with the New Church, the multitudes who jeer and jibe at the pathetic, desolate little group who officially and knowingly, assist at the Sacrifice of Redemption. The grace of office reveals the Truth : the adulation of the masses debilitates, dilutes and demoralizes anyone long subjected to it.

“Who Is Not With Me Is Against Me”

Eternal, Immutable values are in question here. A decision, a judgment must be made. God-made-man, Our Lord Himself said : “who is not with Me, is against Me”. The same Lord laid it down to the Apostles that, having done so much and in vain, they must brush the dust of that self-satisfied city from off their feet and leave its citizens to their chosen perdition. For Pontiffs and for Presidents, for workers and for wasters, the decision must be made. ‘No servant can serve two masters. You cannot serve God and mammon’. When the procedures of justice which Jesus laid down are fulfilled, then those who refuse to obey must be anathema. A judgment must be made. Saint Thomas More, St. John Fisher, St. Margaret Clitheroe, St. Edmund Campion and millions before them and thousands after them wrote their judgment like Our Lord, in their blood.

In the end the ravine rending believers asunder *cannot* be spanned. Between the True and the false “there is fixed

a great chaos so that they who would pass from hence cannot nor from hence come hither". For all who recognize now the chaos, these words of God-made-man Himself blazon across their minds the horror of the division. Come, O Holy Spirit, that all may be wise with the Truth and happy with the pain it brings.

We Have Been Warned

Again and again we are warned by Our Lord that this scenario before us today *could* be: that it *would* be. The manipulators of change, the innovators of new falsehoods, the supplanters of the Holy Spirit—none of them renowned for the essential quality of sanctity—all these have taken advantage of those who, in all simplicity, obey blindly; in all simplicity, go along or perhaps comply with misplaced supernatural hope that all will be well. To these surely Our Lord, gently and kindly, but with a stark finality admonishes: "*no* man putteth a piece from a new garment on on an old garment otherwise he both rendeth the new and the piece taken from the new agreeth not with the old". . . . "And no man putteth new wine into old bottles otherwise the new wine will break the bottles: and it will be spilled and the bottles will be lost". The wine we speak of here is the doctrinal content of the liturgy and the doctrine of salvation itself. "And no man drinking the old hath presently a mind to new: for he saith: the old is better". The stark finality contained in Our Lord's analogy is that, unless the doctrine of salvation becomes a clarion call summoning the dispersed flock, not only will the practice of the Faith cease, but even the very supernatural virtue itself will be lost — "the bottles will be lost". Only the supernatural strength of grace can overcome the preternatural power of the devil. Yet who is not appalled at his triumph?

Prophetic Warnings

Again and yet again the prophetic warnings of Our Lord flash across the minds of the troubled, faithful few. "A house divided against itself cannot stand". Words easily ignored but in the context of today's satanic dispersion of the flock, the content of these words is horrendous.

With the barriers of the fold overrun and trampled down by the liberated sheep, the fold itself no longer offers safety and shelter and salvation in the fulness of Truth. The abandoned Mystical Jesus, the betrayed Mystical Jesus, can no longer be an instrument of salvation for all men because He cannot be recognised. History repeats the life of Christ Our Lord. On the way to Calvary, covered in the dust and spittle and the Precious Blood congealed on His sacred face and hands and on His seamless garment, only the few could recognise the Son of God. Even less still, draped on the cross, did Jesus look like the Divine Redeemer of mankind except to the faithful few. So too today, disfigured and defiled by all manner of heresies and denials and betrayals, the Mystical Body of Christ is visible only to the few. For the rest, the temple is loud with salesmen marketing their own product, the Sacrifice of our Redemption has become the coin of their realm.

The Faithful Few

For the chosen few there is strength and there is comfort in the knowledge that only a few were in attendance when Redemption was put into the hands of mankind. A pathetic group, a Mother in agony, a friend in pain, a sinner in fear. They stood in the unnatural night while thunder rumbled and lightning flashed, spectral bodies rose from graves. Those few stood to witness and to receive the only hope mankind can ever have of escape from everlasting despair. In silence, they stood. Only the Priest Victim of that Holy Mass broke the silence. Only they heard who knew Supernatural Hope was being born. The world meantime passed by, pausing a moment to taunt or to jeer or to joke and make their merry way to their own self-centred pursuits.

The salesmen of the New Church remove the statues of Our Lady from proximity to the Altar, the Sacramental Cross, forgetting that no one stood closer to the Cross at Calvary — *Stabat Mater Juxta Crucem*. When the statue of the Mother of our Redeemer stands once more nearer the altar whereon the Sacrifice of Redemption continues to be made as Jesus commanded, hope will assuredly revive

that the Eternal Father will heal the wound in the Mystical Body, the Church.

All things are possible with God. The heartless rejection on Calvary was transformed by the Holy Spirit in the upper room into a Divine Triumph on Pentecost Sunday. The awful denial of Christ in the Arian Heresy was repealed by the Creed of Athanasius. Even though the devil must work his havoc upon each generation of mortals and with ever increasing efficiency, even though the cacophony of modernism smothers the gentle remonstrances of the saints and martyrs, even though the thrust of lust drains the love of sacrifice; even so, there will be the faithful few. Our Lord did not die in vain.

The tumult of the crowd is disconcerting, but when Our Lord spoke Supernatural Truths, the multitudes melted away. "This is a hard saying and who can hear it", they said, preferring a mere human person to give them what they wanted and so "they walked no more with Him". Salvation does not lie within the scope of human endeavours. Still less must it be mistaken for the clayton's comfort of numbers. Clearly, scripture warns us, there is no mass redemption.

The charade cannot be played much longer. Sooner or later the facade which hides a Divine Institution denigrated and defiled must be torn away. The same Jesus who is weak and humble is also the most severe of all judges. Already He has pronounced sentence upon all who lead his beloved redeemed into sin or error. The devilish clamour with which the Mystical Body of Jesus is being dismembered and destroyed drowns His judgment on scandal mongers. "Woe to that man by whom scandal cometh" (Matt. 18.7. "But he that shall scandalise one of these little ones that believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck and that he should be drowned in the depths of the sea". No one, not any one, no matter how drunk with euphoria of diabolic liberty, none can but be paralysed with holy fear should that same Divine Authority pronounce again that same fearful Divine verdict. It must be done.

The Author of this most sympathetic piece of writing is an American member of the Church of England. He shows what the Catholic struggle to retain the Tridentine Mass means to so many High Anglicans today.

Anglicans and the Tridentine Rite

JEFFREY G. DORRANCE

MANY Roman Catholics and Anglican Catholics are perplexed as to why, from an Anglican viewpoint, the Tridentine Rite merits retention. In order that these might appreciate the extra-“parochial” importance of the Tridentine Rite, Anglicans and Romans alike ought to consider the *context* of the *Book of Common Prayer* or BCP, the potential for Anglicans of the decree of the papacy entitled *Quo Primum*, and the duties imposed upon all Anglicans by their own bishops in the so-called Chicago Quadrilateral.

Context of the BCP

Although “Low” Church Anglicans and traditionalist Roman Catholics have long emphasized the Reformation influences on this book (which influences are admittedly there), we need to remember that most of the BCP is comprised of material extracted from the Gregorian liturgy as known in England in 1549. The Gregorian liturgy, largely established under Charlemagne by Bd. Alcuin of York (and hence itself somewhat influenced by English liturgical customs), is of course the ancestor of the Tridentine Rite. The BCP is not a complete liturgy in and of itself. Many people fail to fully appreciate this. When it is used solely by itself, the celebrant at Mass is not told what to wear, where to stand, where to put his hands or how to hold them, how to decorate the Altar (beyond vesting it with a fair linen cloth), what colors to vest himself in by season, how to vest his ser-

vers (or whether to have servers), where to place his servers, what his servers should do, similarly his choir (or whether to have one), what private prayers to say if any, what proper to use on lesser feast days, what anthems to employ, what prayers to say on uncommon special occasions, what tone(s) of voice to use, whether to chant certain sections and which sections and how to do so, or what if any gestures to use and when so to do. And we have only spoken of the Mass. What of other services? Same problem. Most Anglicans depend for all of this on "Anglican tradition", which tradition is usually the Tridentine Rite (in whole or in part). Some resort to the Sarum Use, but only if they are liturgical scholars. The reason for this is that the Sarum Use, outside of the BCP, is largely a dead liturgy enshrined in rare books. By contrast the Tridentine Rite (like the Sarum based on the Gregorian liturgy), is far easier to refer to and it has been published along with Sarum material for Anglican use in such works as *Ritual Notes*, *The Anglican Missal*, *The English Missal*, *The American Missal*, *The Manual for Priests*, and *The Monastic Diurnal*, and other works. But it takes a *living* liturgy constantly in use to truly educate people in how to do things correctly. No book can tell it all and any book can be misunderstood. Thus it was that, in the past, Anglican clergy would commonly "drop by" at Roman Catholic parishes so as to really get the feel of things. That feel was the Tridentine Rite as established by Pope St. Pius V. Were that liturgy to become as dead as its Latin, Anglican clergy would no longer be able to get that important feel of how to use the BCP within its original context.

In 1549, various English uses of the Gregorian liturgy were culled from and then combined (unfortunately with some extraneous Reformation material), to form what is now the Anglican Use, the *Book of Common Prayer*. The most important of these ancient uses drawn from was, of course, the Sarum Use. In 1570, the Tridentine Fathers did the same with their continental uses so as to form the Tridentine Rite, but excluding from their culling certain of the more ancient Western liturgies used in Toledo, Milan and elsewhere. They did not issue a-book-of-common-prayer (i.e. a book of public and aloud prayers common to

everybody on feasts commonly observed throughout the Church). That came much later in the twentieth century with the publication of such things as "peoples missals" and so forth. Instead, they published a complete missal for use by the clergy at the altar, the *Missale Romanum*. Because of its greater completeness, the *Missale Romanum* and its accompanying ceremonial directions is what Anglicans generally go by in using the BCP. It is the rudder that guides our Anglican liturgical ship. As we use it and to the degree that we do, we keep our ship from wandering to and fro.

There is, of course some "wandering" of the Anglican Use from place to place. This is sometimes, if rather loosely and often much misunderstood, seen in various gradations of "high" church and "low" church. What it really boils down to is the extent to which this or that parish is faithful to the Tridentine standard. But even where only loosely followed, the Tridentine Rite manages to keep the variety of parish custom within reasonable limits so that the Anglican liturgical ship does not wander off course entirely.

The Potential of Quo Primum

When the Tridentine Rite was promulgated by Pope Pius V, he issued a solemn proclamation (*Quo Primum*), a promise invoking the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to the effect that never would the Tridentine Mass be forbidden or altered. This is well known to traditionalist Roman Catholics and frequently appealed to by them. Somewhat less well known perhaps is that *Quo Primum* also extends important privileges to other ancient liturgies of the Western Church then in use for at least 200 years prior (e.g. the Mozarabic and Ambrosian rites). One such liturgy, at least argueably, was the Sarum Use, the remnants of which are contained in the BCP. If the Tridentine Rite can be denied to its adherents, despite papal assurances, so also can the Sarum Use as contained in the BCP. Conversely, when we Anglicans defend the right of Roman Catholics to their Tridentine liturgy, in consideration of *Quo Primum*, we are also defending our own rights under the very same papal assurance. An attack on the Tridentine Rite is also

an attack upon the *Book of Common Prayer*. In connection with this, it is interesting to compare the satanic "Book of Common Prayer" of the Episcopal Church (1979) with the "New Mass" which the Pope threw at the Roman Catholic Church in 1969. The comparisons are frightening.

The Duties Imposed Upon Anglicans by the Chicago Quadrilateral

In 1886, the American college of bishops of the Anglican Catholic Church met in Chicago. At that meeting the Chicago Fathers issued an appeal to all calling themselves Christians in the United States of America. They asked all to unite under the Bible, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the "historic" Episcopate. Most Anglicans are aware of this. What they are often less well aware of is that their bishops assured all non-Anglicans (which would obviously include all Roman Catholics), that Anglicans do not seek the overthrow of any Liturgy so as to impose the *Book of Common Prayer*. In a sense, the Chicago Quadrilateral is akin to *Quo Primum*. And it is, in fact, a change in course from previous Anglican policy given that prior to 1886 the Church of England did attempt to impose upon England's Romanist minority (the "recusants"), the *Book of Common Prayer*, an attempt (in large measure necessitated by political circumstances), that resulted in the grisly executions of many Romanist clergy and laity. But in 1886 Anglicans began to turn away from that earlier policy. The present official Anglican policy is and has long been complete acceptance of the Tridentine Rite. Anglicans have finally come to realise that by standing up for other peoples rights they also stand up for their own as well. As an Anglican, I hope and I pray that my Roman Catholic brothers and sisters in the one true Faith will appreciate what I am saying here and that they will be moved to respond similarly, as I an Anglican am joining them in their struggle for that which is rightfully theirs. This is difficult for them, I know, given their past attitudes towards the *Book of Common Prayer* and the circumstances which brought that book into existence. But we might want to consider this, that when they attack Anglican Catholics and the Anglican Catholic

liturgy, they also are attacking some of their most fervent supporters. Anglican Catholics do not wish to retain anything in the BCP that is not orthodox, Catholic, and true. But they do wish to retain a liturgy they believe to be Catholic (particularly in so far as it is mothered, governed and enriched by the Tridentine tradition). Likewise, Anglican Catholics, if they expect tolerance from others need themselves to tolerate and be sensitive to other peoples religious convictions *so long as these do not conflict with the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Faith.*

SURPRISE AT WALSINGHAM

Imagine our surprise therefore when entering the great Basilica at the Catholic Shrine at Walsingham, this week, to discover that the tabernacle had been moved from the left hand side of the altar (in a cupboard) to the right hand corner of the wall — certainly NOT the focal point, as in past days. When enquiring, we find it has been moved to allow Our Lady of Walsingham's picture to be placed over what was the said cupboard. No question of the central location desireability. On entering the ancient Slipper Chapel, we find all the Votive candles have gone — to another room where there is no Blessed Sacrament — when enquiring why these Votive Candles, lit by the faithful for prayers in front of Our Lady of Walsingham's statue for nearly 100 years in modern times, have been moved — we are informed — “for aesthetic reasons”. Clearly these moves conform to what I term “Modern Catholic Marketing” but one wonders why the Powers that Be allow the faithful to be further outraged.

Curiously, our Separated Brethren's Shrine have their tabernacle firmly in place “where it should be — centrally on the High Altar”, and their votive candles likewise where they should be! It seems we have much to learn from the “Anglicans”— especially re the correct location of the Blessed Sacrament in the churches of Mother Catholic Church.

—Pilgrim

In this percipient and urbane piece of writing, Sir John Biggs-Davison says a great deal that so many have been saying for a long time, and are continuing to say more and more loudly today.

Honour to God

SIR JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON, M.P.

WHAT a pity that Strangers may not enter their gallery until after Mr. Speaker's Chaplain—or, on rare occasions, Mr. Speaker himself, as, I have observed, in some other Commonwealth legislatures—has read the prayers for the parliament. The sight and sound would be more edifying than some of the rapidly ensuing proceedings when those who do not know us well might think that we were not all free from “partial affections” and might also doubt our “love and charity one towards another”.

The prayers have not changed substantially since they were drafted on older foundations at the time of the restoration of the monarchy and the re-establishment of the Church of England. I recall several years ago a clergyman standing in for the Speaker's chaplain substituted “who are” for “which art” in the Lord's Prayer. The solecism has not to my knowledge been repeated.

Their progressive Lordships vary the Psalm read at the outset. In the Commons it is always the same. Those who crave for modernity or topicality—the difficulties of which are obvious — will find that, if they meditate upon the prayers, they cover all our needs.

They are indeed the very stuff of liturgy. The historian, Professor Owen Chadwick, said ‘Liturgies are not made; they grow in the devotion of centuries’. When I graduated from the Anglican to the Roman communion I parted with grief from the liturgy of the Establishment, much superior in language to the English version we now enjoy, or endure, since the Second Vatican Council.

Those were not ecumenical times. On the other hand, some priests and parsons said that they worked better together without all the commissions, committees and bureaucracy that surround inter-church relations. The Jesuit who received me into the Roman Catholic Church was desolate when he was told that he might not go to the war memorial with his regiment on Remembrance Day. When I asked the then Bishop of Brentwood if I might attend with the British Legion in my constituency he said no and that he was surprised that I had even asked! The ecumenism of wartime (Archbishop Temple and Cardinal Hinsley) had been followed by a tightening up. Ecumenism is now again *de rigueur* and Anglicans and Roman Catholics frequently attend each other's services. I am embarrassed when Anglican friends return from a Roman Catholic wedding or funeral horrified by the banality of much that is said or sung. They ask me what has become of the Church they had admired although they could not accept its claims.

The impoverished vernacular mass is an example of the optional becoming compulsory, or nearly so. Latin was not abolished by the Second Vatican Council. The appropriate pronouncement of the Council, the *Constitution on the Liturgy*, of 1963, states unequivocally that "the use of the Latin language is to be preserved in the Latin rites". To come home, the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales, at their Low Week meetings in 1975 declared :

"The Conference urges priests to see that the Latin Mass in the new rite is encouraged".

This indeed was the intention of both Council and Pope. In 1980 Pope John Paul II said that :

"The Roman Church has special obligations towards Latin . . . and she must manifest them whenever the opportunity presents itself".

Some cling desperately or in hope to the splendid old Tridentine rite. The Pope has laid down that it should be available to those who demand it. At the same time, the new rite, well sung or said in Latin—with the additional and more varied Bible readings provided in the new liturgy read in the vernacular—is also worthy of the highest act of Christian worship.

The Book of Common Prayer drew much from the pre-Reformation church. It was then regrettable that the International Commission for the English Liturgy, which drew up our mid-Atlantic vernacular Mass, did not profit by the 1662 book and, indeed, by that of 1549 which owed much to the Sarum Rite. This I have witnessed done splendidly in Latin at St. Etheldreda's, Ely Place and it was celebrated under Anglican auspices for the repose of the souls of the *Mary Rose* mariners. But, as I know from my friends of the Prayer Book Society, some of whose meetings I have attended as a 'fraternal delegate' the Service Book entitled "Alternative" seems to be becoming as compulsory as the optional vernacular Roman Liturgy.

The matchless language of the Book of Common Prayer was already becoming archaic when it was written. It is a hieratic language. Latin, with some vestigial Greek, is the hieratic and the international language of the Western (Roman) church, as Greek is the hieratic language of Eastern Christendom, including Eastern churches in communion with Rome. Jesus spoke Aramaic. The language used in the synagogue was Hebrew.

A hieratic language imposes discipline upon celebrants. Its importance as the steward of tremendous mysteries calls for proper humility. In the Roman Catholic Church lapses from sacrality and decent dignity occur most when English not Latin is used. Many celebrants feel free to depart from text and rubric and egoistically to inject novelties which soon become a distracting bore to regular worshippers. The new liturgy is an example of talking down to a generation supposed to be better educated than before. Roman Catholics who like a "cafeteria" liturgy like to say that "the people of God have come of age". Yet, in a vernacular collect, these adult Catholics are not expected to cope with a clause in a sentence. Again "Lamb of God you take away the sins of the world. . ."

The notion that a congregation of ordinary people cannot understand a ceremony in Latin or Cranmer's English is false and patronising. Ordinary people understand Shakespeare. An understanding of a rite, is not simply literal. It is also spiritual and psychological.

It is difficult to believe that for 1,500 years our forefathers assisted at a Mass of which they had no understanding. Before the vernacular became vogue I knew Roman Catholic congregations of simple country folk who sung or said their Latin responses with perfect ease. Their missals carried a translation on the opposite page. A Latin liturgical revival was killed not by Vatican II so much as by the iconoclasts, who justified every atrocity, not by the decrees of the Council, which were little read, but by the spirit of the Council as they chose to interpret it.

Lex orandi lex credendi: "as we pray, so we believe". There is a place for special services and special devotions to suit varied needs and different people. Nor is the grandson of an Ulster presbyterian minister one to belittle extempore prayers and spontaneous forms of worship. But let the guitarist respect those who prefer Tallis or Gregorian chant. Above all, the purpose of divine worship is not to make ourselves feel cosy but to do our duty and honour to God. The furore and unhappiness of the Falklands service could have been avoided if the established church had used its own service prescribed for a victory or a deliverance! That service gives God the glory.

Anglicans and Roman Catholics in this country imitate each other in an ecumenical iconoclasm. They leap-frog each other down the trendy trail of banality. Let there be an ecumenical reassertion of true liturgy.

I read in the *Catholic Herald*:

The truth is that there is in Europe a growing traditionalism especially among the young, who are dissatisfied with the secularised theology and the seeming devaluation of the liturgy.

So the future is not lost.

The dispute that broke out some weeks ago, on the occasion of an Address given by the Prime Minister before the Annual Assembly of the Church of Scotland, revealed a sad lack of sound social principle on the part of those who were parties to it. In this article, Father Crane endeavours to make good this deficiency.

CURRENT COMMENT

The Church and the Public Good

THE EDITOR

Frost and Flack

I SAT down to write this article on June 29th of this year. This was the day when the Methodist Conference, on its third day of discussion, voted overwhelmingly to declare its sense of outrage at the way government policies were "increasing the wealth of the rich at the expense of the poor". Thereby, participants were adding their not insignificant voice to the clamour which has surrounded the relationship between Religion and Politics since the Prime Minister stated her personal belief as to what it should be in an Address to the Annual Assembly of the Church of Scotland on May 25th of this year, 1988. On that occasion, the reception accorded her words was distinctly frosty. Since then, a good deal of flack has been thrown at and all around her, mainly by Churchmen, High and Low, with a good sprinkling of politicians, mainly of what might be described as a left-of-centre bent.

The Need for Ordered Moral Principle

What continues to strike me about this outpouring of flack is the lack of ordered moral principle which appears to pervade it. For this, there is substituted a deeply—and no doubt sincerely—felt set of prejudices expressed by so

many of the flack-throwers in terms of emotional declamation which, of its very nature, precludes any attempted rational reply. Take, for example, the concept which appears to underlie the outpourings of so many of them; viz., that it is the *primary* duty of government to care *directly* for those in need. The protagonists of this way of thinking have no time and no more than an earful of slogans for those who would deny that this duty is *primary* and that under normal circumstances the task of government is to care *directly* for those in need. This denial needs close consideration on a basis of social and moral principle and this is what I shall give it in the course of this article. I shall begin by asking myself a straightforward question, which will take longer to answer, I think, than most readers imagine. The question is simply this, what is the basic (as distinct from the immediate) purpose of any human and social grouping, large or small, including that which we call civic and which is contained within the boundaries of a country or State.

Man's Basic Purpose in Life

By way of a preliminary to this inquiry, we have to try and find out the basic purpose in life (as often as not, recognised only dimly) of each of the individual human beings who make up a social grouping. That done, we need to see how membership of the group promotes that basic purpose, whatever its immediate objective may be. Against this background, it should not be difficult to discover how the government of a country should conduct itself with regard to these groupings; what the relationship of government to them should be — supportive or suppressive, supplementary or supplantive. This is the way we have to go. There is no other way. Emotional declamation, still less slogan-mongering, gets you nowhere with this question. Principled approach is the only way. It is time to attempt it.

First, then, what is man's purpose in life? Why is he here on this earth? Being a Catholic myself, the only answer I can give is one that is Catholic and Christian — and, therefore, true — and that applies to the whole of mankind, irrespective of religion or race. Man is here to save his soul; meaning by that to make his way through life

back to God in accordance with God's law for mankind; i.e. for human beings as a whole, irrespective of religion or race. Created out of nothing by God, all are totally dependent on Him and obliged, in consequence, to serve Him; which means, in practice, by setting their lives within the framework of God's law in their regard; which Law we call the Natural Law or, as the late Frank Sheed has put it so well, God's instructions in man's regard.

Man's Final Destiny, under God, in His Own Hands

The next thing, I think that has to be grasped in this context is that every man — irrespective of religion or race — is created by God with a human soul which makes him the *human* being that he is. His humanity is expressed through the exercise of his essentially human powers of understanding and will which are rooted in his human soul. Every man is, as the scholastic philosophers have defined him, a *rational animal*, gifted with powers, which define his typical (human) method of acting as that which is exercised through the employment of his understanding and his will. It follows at once from what has been said that, where the work of his own salvation is concerned, man's task stands more broadly defined as that of using his human powers to hold to God's instructions in his regard, thereby accomplishing under God the work of his salvation. In this work he is by nature — because he is the human being that he is — a co-operator with the God who made him. His dignity flows from the fact that, endowed as he is by God with a non-material human soul, itself gifted with essentially human powers of understanding and will, man stands, thereby, at the top of visible creation because more like God, his Creator, than any other visibly created being. Man is no mere animal. There is nothing of the dumb ox about him. A little less than the angels, he has his final destiny, under God, in his own hands. The least that can be done then, by the government of any country of which he is a citizen is that it should respect every man's inborn and inalienable right to make his way through life responsibly under God and with respect for the rights of all others — irrespective of religion, race or creed — to do the same. In short, it is the basic duty of governments to sup-

port and encourage the citizen in the right use of his human powers. To the extent that he co-operates with his Creator in this fashion, man draws closer to God, becoming over the years the fine person that he should be; not seeking that fineness of personality for its own sake, by way of a first priority, never that; but accepting it as it comes steadily over the years, unobtrusively as an inevitable by-product of his steady striving over the years to hold to the law of God.

Man's Dignity Enhanced by Holding to God's Law

In such a one, we should expect to find a balanced freedom, a marked sense of responsibility towards others, quiet self-reliance. The whole poles apart from the self-assertive arrogance that typifies so many today, whose absorption is primarily with their own ego; who see themselves, not God, as the masters of their own lives. For the true human being who is a Christian, it is quite other. For him, man's ultimate goal is God, not himself. His way to God is through the following of God's Law. By reason of that following his dignity as a person can only be enhanced. Why so? Because, as we have seen above, man's dignity is from his soul, with its powers of understanding and will, which make him more like God than any other visibly created being. From which it follows that the employment by man of his human powers in holding to God's law in his regard can only enhance his dignity as a person and so his likeness to God! "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice (righteousness) and all the rest will be added unto you". In short, true growth as a person, which is what enhancement of dignity means, can never be sought for its own sake. Of its very nature, it is a by-product, which comes to those who use their human powers to hold to the Law of God which governs their lives.

The Basic Point of Any Social Grouping

We have been a long time, coming a long way. We are near the point now which is that, given man's *basic* purpose in life, the *basic* point of any social grouping is found in the opportunity it affords for the extended employment, in the pursuit of that purpose of human powers and,

thereby, the enhancement of the dignity of those who are partners to it and, again thereby, their increased ability to co-operate with God in the upholding of His Law in their regard. From this it follows that the basic purpose of government, which is the basic good of the individual citizen — the enhancement of his dignity as a person as described above — lays on those who rule the duty of working on the socio-economic set-up of the countries they govern in such a way as to hold out to as many as possible the opportunity of an extended use of their human powers. This can only result in the growth throughout the community as a whole of those qualities of measured freedom, social responsibility and self-reliance on which alone true social harmony can rest. By reason of that harmony, the individual citizen is found with increased opportunity of co-operating with God in the work of his salvation. To the extent that it is supportive of existing smaller groupings within a country and working to create openings for those which have yet to exist, government may be said to be faithful to its basic purpose; which is the enhancement of the dignity of each of its citizens. This cannot be done directly through what might be termed the hand-out economy of a Nanny State. This way lies servitude. The citizen has a right to the opportunity of gaining a sufficiency as an aid to his duty of living like a true human being. From which it follows that there is no sense and little morality in a system that provides him with a sufficiency (say, through State hand-outs) at the price of depriving him of the opportunity to which he has a right, of living like a true human being. A government which sets up a system that we can call, accurately enough, the Nanny State, denies thereby the very purpose of its existence.

The Bridge that Links the Church's Primary Purpose with Her Work in the Social Field

As I see it, you have here, in the enhancement of human dignity that flows from true human co-operation within the lesser social groupings that are set within a country's boundaries, the bridge that links the Church's primary objective, which is the salvation of souls, with her work in

the social field amongst men. This work should never be sought for its own sake by the Church's representatives in the social field; but only as an enhancement of human dignity and, thereby, as an aid to salvation. Where the Catholic Church is concerned, work in the socio-economic field is always ancillary; supportive — and none the less important for that — of the sole reason for her existence which is the salvation of men's souls.

Let Pope Pius XI Have the Last Word

It is time to let Pope Pius XI have the last word on this subject. You will find it in *Quadragesimo Anno*; in English more at length, "On Reconstructing the Social Order and Perfecting it conformably to the Precepts of the Gospel in Commemoration of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*". A mouthful certainly, but a good, solid one at that. That splendid, fighting Pope proceeds :

"When we speak of the reform of institutions, it is principally the State that comes to mind. Not indeed that all salvation is to be hoped from its interventions; but because on account of the evil of 'individualism', as We called it, things have come to pass that the highly developed social life which once flourished in a variety of associations organically linked with each other, has been damaged and all but ruined leaving thus only individuals and the State, to the no small detriment of the State itself. Social life has entirely lost its organic form; the State, today encumbered with all the burdens once born by these associations now destroyed, has been submerged and overwhelmed by an infinity of occupations and duties.

"It is indeed true, as history clearly proves, that owing to changed circumstances much that was formerly done by small groups can nowadays only be done by larger associations. None the less, just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to a group what private industry can accomplish, so too it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order, for a larger and higher association to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and

lower societies. This is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable. Of its very nature the true aim of all social activity should be to help members of the social body, but never to absorb or destroy them.

"The State, therefore, should leave to smaller groups the settlement of business of minor importance, which otherwise would greatly distract it; it will thus carry out with greater freedom, power and success the tasks belonging to it alone, because it alone can effectively accomplish these: directing, watching, stimulating, restraining, as circumstances suggest and necessity demands. Let those in power, therefore, be convinced that the more faithfully this principle of subsidiary function be followed, and a graded hierarchical order exist between various associations, the greater will be both social authority and social efficiency, and the happier and more prosperous the condition of the commonwealth." (Paras. 78-80, C.T.S. Edition)

It would be a good thing if the flack-throwers of the last two months could be persuaded to take to heart, not only this trenchant passage, but the great Encyclical that contains it. In these slogan-mongering days, I fear my hope in this regard is vain.

PLEASE NOTE

That any book mentioned in this or other issues of *Christian Order* is obtainable from :

Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop,
4, Brownhill Road,
London SE26 2FJ : UK.

and

Carmel of Plymouth,
1, Grenville Road,
St. Jude's,
Plymouth : UK.

This article, written by a member of its minute staff, aims to show readers something of the workings of a magazine which, by all accounts, is steadily drawing more and more into its readership.

Christian Order: How the System Works

CLENCY MARIAPA

WE hope that this article will give our readers an inside view of how *Christian Order* is edited and "managed". It is long overdue and we hope it will help to explain our shortcomings.

Editing and Printing

The magazine is published ten times a year and has a circulation of some 8,200. It is edited by Fr. Crane. He is solely responsible for the choice of articles, the setting up and format of the magazine, the proof-reading before the magazine is finally printed at Lithographic Universal (Bray, County Wicklow, Ireland). *Christian Order* is then taken to and despatched from N. Ireland to various parts of the world, except for Airmail copies which are despatched from London. Postal charges have much to do with this despatching procedure.

The Administration

Each subscriber has a master card, a record card and an address stencil. The address stencils are used in London to print subscribers' names on *Christian Order* envelopes. The addressed envelopes are then packed up and sent to the printers ready for the magazine to be inserted and despatched.

The 8,200 subscribers obviously did not all start their subscriptions in the same month or the same year. Some subscribers have been on the subscription list for years while others are coming on to it this very day and will no doubt continue to renew their subscriptions in the months

to come. Hence the need to send out subscription reminder-letters every month. Reminders are sent out twelve months after the date of the initial subscription payment, assuming that the subscription has not been renewed already). December and January are the heaviest months in terms of subscribers. Nearly a thousand reminder letters are sent out in each of these months. The remaining ten months carry on average some 700 subscribers.

Reminder-letters

These are of three categories: A, B and C.

Category A reminders are sent out to subscribers, who subscribe for themselves alone, in the month renewal is due.

Category B reminders are sent out to those who subscribe for themselves and others in the same renewal month.

Category C reminders are sent to subscribers who pay for others in a different month (this also applies to non-subscribers who are donors); e.g. X may have started his/her subscription in January — in which case he/she will receive a reminder next January. X may also have taken a subscription for Y in April — in which case X (the donor) will receive another reminder next April, regarding Y's renewal. If X is a donor to a friend in every month of the year, then X will probably receive reminder letters every month of the year as the subscriptions fall due in each month for his or her various friends.

Categories B & C reminders are usually typed, while Category A Reminders are processed through a manual addressograph machine using the address stencils and hence the identical address on reminder-letters and envelopes.

All subscribers are sent a second reminder three weeks after the first one and a third reminder three weeks after the second, if they have not already renewed by then. It is a long and expensive process but one that that Editor believes is worth it, in that it gives subscribers the maximum opportunity to renew their subscriptions. All reminders must be folded, put in envelopes along with return envelopes before being sealed and stamps stuck on. The system does not always work as well as we would want it

to. Very often reminder-letters and subscription renewals do cross — which can cause frustration to subscribers.

Prior to reminder-letters being sent out, it is necessary to sort out those who have already renewed for that month from those who need a reminder. The stencils of these letters are then picked out and processed to address their reminder-letters and envelopes. This process takes place prior to the second and third reminders being sent out in order that those who have renewed are not sent a further reminder. Again, the system isn't perfect and inevitably some who have already renewed do still get a further reminder. We assure them that we are trying our best to avoid these frustrating situations.

Early Renewals

These are those sent in before reminder-letters are sent out. They are always welcome as they cut the cost of sending reminders, but, unavoidably, they involve more work. Early renewals come in ordinary letters. This means going to the master-card to find out in which month the subscribers' subscription is due, in order to mark his/her subscription card. Although this sounds quite simple, it is a very time-consuming exercise especially when early subscribers come in droves. Late renewals not using the reminder-letter from *Christian Order* involve the same process.

A good number of letters received (and that includes subscription renewals) take the form of no more than a signed note, without the sender printing his/her name or giving an address. Quite often, we have to go to great lengths, with the help of a magnifying glass, to try and decipher the name of the correspondent. More often than not this turns out to be a futile exercise. These "letters" then go unanswered or the subscription card cannot be marked up. Inevitably these correspondents are sent a reminder letter at some later date and all hell is then let loose!

Changes of Address

A major source of frustration for many is, without doubt, a change of address, basically because two months later

Christian Order is still going to the old address. Why does this happen? Once notification of a change of address is received it is noted and goes on a list until at least a dozen changes of address are gathered. If you are thinking that it may take a long time before twelve changes of address can be collected, let us assure you that we have a constant flow of changes of address. They are then sent to another firm for a new stencil to be cut (*Christian Order* does not have the necessary staff to cope). This process (conducted through the post) takes some three weeks. The old stencils are then replaced by the new ones and as *Christian Order* envelopes are addressed monthly in advance it may be two to three months before a change of address comes into effect. The old stencil is not removed until the new one has been received, because the magazine can, most of the time, be re-addressed if the subscriber has left a forwarding address. Apart from the actual changing of stencil, a change of address may, and often does, involve further administrative work in that cross-reference amendments may have to be made to the donor's and/or recipient's cards.

New Subscribers

A new subscriber is sent the current issue of *Christian Order* straight away, while the subscriber's name is sent away for a stencil to be cut. A hand-written envelope is then made ready for the following *Christian Order* to make sure that he/she does not miss out any issue before his/her stencil is filed and joins the mass of subscribers. There may be duplication if the stencil arrives earlier than expected—in which case the new subscriber will receive two copies of a particular issue, one hand-written and one typed. After this inevitable hiccough, normality then sets in.

Airmail subscriptions are handled at the office in London—where envelopes are filled, stamps affixed and AIRMAIL stamped, and then despatched—all done manually to keep down the cost of the magazine. Other menial duties that need attending to are the printing of reminder letters, the stamping of return envelopes, cancellations and typing bulk labels. All this may sound very simple and insignificant but they are the small details that are highly time-consum-

ing — especially when almost everything is done by hand.

The Staff

The staff consists of three part-timers apart from Fr. Crane himself. The author of this article looks after the day-to-day administrative duties concerned with the running of the magazine. He is assisted by two charming ladies. Mary Waddelove comes in once a month to type the B and C reminder-letters and she types the bulk labels at home. (These are then sent to Ireland where bulk orders are parcelled up and despatched in the same way as ordinary single ones.) Mary Gaffney comes in once a week to do the filing. The two ladies are voluntary workers and their generosity helps to keep *Christian Order* relatively cheap. The magazine is run literally on a skeleton staff. We do not have a despatch department, we do not have an accounts department and we do not have a computer despite what some readers suggest in their letters.

Philip Douglas stands in for an Accounts Department. He comes in most generously once a week to do our banking. He comes in from far and does it absolutely voluntarily, which again helps to cut down on costs.

An Increasingly Important Message of Hope

Although the system sounds archaic and runs on a skeleton staff, it has worked sufficiently well over the years to keep the bulk of our subscribers happy and to keep *Christian Order* an economically viable concern. Inevitably it has caused some inconvenience to a section of our readership and for that we do apologise. Our low prices mean that we operate within stringent financial constraints. To deal with our shortcomings will necessitate an increase in cost — which will put the magazine out of the reach of many readers. We believe and we know the magazine has an increasingly important message of hope and light in a world of increasing confusion and turmoil in church affairs. For that reason alone we have to keep the magazine within the reach of a greater number of readers. We try hard to do this. We know from reliable sources that its influence is a good deal more than considerable, and steadily increasing. Its circulation is world-wide.

In this incisive article, Peter Wilders shows the nature and extent of the disaster that the false and now failing theory of evolution has brought to the Catholic Church.

What's Happened ?

PETER WILDERS

Today's Tragedy for so Many Catholics

THE tragedy for many Catholics today is that they can see what is wrong, but feel powerless to do anything about it. A little like a group of passengers on an ocean-going liner that has been holed by an iceberg and is listing badly and who know that the ship is out of control and disaster is near, but discover that for some reason nobody except themselves seems to think anything is wrong. The wining and dining continue and the captain and crew seem quite oblivious of the fact that the vessel is sinking. Those in the Church today, who see the flagrant abuse of sacred doctrine, and the channels of grace from heaven blocked by large numbers of clergy and laity exchanging Christ's infallible teaching for a form of religion that is alien to the Church, meeting so often with silent indifference, if not hostility, from higher authority within the Church towards which they turn for help. Not unnaturally, they feel alarmed, frustrated and even persecuted.

Enormous Issues Involved

They are vaguely aware that enormous issues are involved. Of course, they are not mistaken. The Great Adversary, whom nobody seems to take very seriously any more, is clearly master-minding the greatest rebellion against God's divine will since the Garden of Eden affair. Our Lady's appeal for Russia to be consecrated to her Immaculate Heart has been in vain. The consequences of ignoring her plea have, as she warned, come to pass. The Marxist empire has spread and now covers over half the world. Why didn't Rome listen to her ? The shrinking and secularist non-Communist world has abused its liberty of expression and its democracy, by passing laws that defy

God's commandments. Secularist atheism, propagated by the strongest communications media that has ever existed since the beginning of time, has assumed massive proportions. Warnings written into the Church's Magisterium regarding subversive reading and viewing have been ignored to the point where Catholic schools' literature and philosophy classes are based principally upon works of secularist authors. Eroticism, as a feature of television programmes and much other publicity, is tacitly tolerated by a clergy and laity who view regularly. Catholic papers recommend the products of a film industry that has abandoned any pretext of morality for years. There is the ingenuous, or perhaps convenient, belief that, provided the major part of the book, paper, television or film programme is not immoral, the part that is can be overlooked. This is rather like believing that a few drops of arsenic in an otherwise delicious cake will do no harm. The only difference between these two examples is that in one the body is attacked; in the other, the soul. Yet still the plea for God's help not to be led into temptation continues. What has appened? Why does nobody seem to think anything is wrong? Are they under some kind of a spell? Have they been conditioned to the point that they cannot tell right from wrong? Or, worse still, is it us who have been misled and are being punished for our self-righteousness? In finding answers it sometimes helps to go back to the beginning.

Two Major Catastrophes

The two major catastrophes in the turbulent history of the world since creation, were the rebellion amongst the the angels and the rebellion of the first human couple. The influence of these two events upon each individual in each of the generations since has never diminished; and there is every reason to believe it is as strong today as ever it has been. Lucifer and his legions have the same singleness of purpose; which is to separate man from his Maker. Being unable to make any claim upon God Himself, they do the next best thing, and that is to claim human beings who are created in His image. Our fallen nature, inherited as a consequence of the rebellion or Original Sin of the two people from whom the whole of mankind has descended, leaves us pitifully vulnerable

to God's intransigent enemies. Our only hope is in the spiritual defences made available to Adam and Eve after their expulsion from the Garden of Eden. These were transmitted to us through the ages by the faithful, the chosen people, and made more abundant by the second Adam, Christ the founder of the Church of God. Without this defence we are no match for the Prince of Darkness. Little by little, without our being properly aware of what is happening, our minds and souls can be transformed into instruments for Satan's own evil purposes. The great tyrants of history were, no doubt, victims of such a process; which explains how they were capable of doing the things they did despite being created in the image of God. The power of the Devil is greatly underestimated, if not considered as totally irrelevant in our material world. Yet the means of defence are there at our disposal. They are guaranteed shatteringly effective for an entire lifetime !

A God-given Defence System Against Error

Now, theoretically, all members of God's Church, should not only be equipped with this defense system but be using it actively. If they were, however, the apparent anomalies mentioned above should not exist. So where's the snag ? Well, let's look at the defences. The principal weapon in the Church's armoury is the certitude attached to its interpretation of God's word. It is a bit like a guarantee given by a cartographer that the directions on his map will lead to the desired destination. In the case under review the destination is heaven and God's words our directions. At Pentecost the Apostles were made to understand exactly the meaning of Christ's words by no less an authority than the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. That single unalterable meaning was given into the safekeeping of the Church. This has been written down in a form approved by the successors of the Apostles. It is our guarantee that no mere man can apply to it any other interpretation than the one intended. The infallible teaching of the Church bears not only the seal of authority but the guarantee of truth. When Christ said "I am the way, the truth and the life", He revealed to us that His word, as contained in the Church's sacred doctrine, is the truth that leads to eternal life with the Son, the Father and the Holy Ghost.

The only way to Heaven is through God's word. To question that word is to question the ability of the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, to make the meaning of the word clear.

Foundational Doctrines of the Church now Contested

Of course, there is nothing new in all this. Yet, in the present situation, one can only assume that most people are not aware of it and that many of those that are, have found reasons for not taking it seriously. The assumption arises from the fact that the foundational doctrines of the Church, such as Original Sin and all its connected doctrines, i.e. Baptism, Redemption and the Immaculate Conception are being contested. The basic reason seems to be that, if man evolved from the power primates it would be biologically and genetically impossible to start the human race with just one man as stated in the Church's infallible doctrinal teaching. A number of Catholic scientists and theologians, in considering the matter, have realised that, if evolution really happened, there is an even more fundamental problem. If man evolved from a line of creatures gradually developing human characteristics, these creatures, or "hominidae", would at some stage have been more man-like than ape-like. They are supposed to have made weapons and tools, and even cultivated land, long before reaching the level of "homo sapiens". Such activities, however, would have required reasoning ability of a conceptual nature only available through the intellectual faculties of a human soul! The human soul is made in the image of God. On this point the Church is quite adamant. The dilemma is, therefore, quite obvious. If a human soul existed before the first totally human body, even assuming for some inexplicable biological reason just one of these "hominid" creatures evolved into man, (what happened to all the others is a mystery, and where woman came from is an even greater one!) then the first "homo sapiens" would have been the first to have a human body but not the first to have a human soul.

Evolution and Original Sin

Now, as sacred doctrine demands that Adam, the first man, had both the first soul and the first body, even the

unacceptable hypothesis of evolution into man occurring through just one hominid provides no answer. In any case, there is the even more vexing question of the immortality and perfection of the first man. There is no place in evolution theory for ideas of this kind. After all, the theory requires that the first "homo sapiens" were limited in intelligence, virtually inarticulate and the prey of wild animals. The hostile environment in which the first humans were supposed to live bears no resemblance to the Garden of Eden in which the first couple conversed with their creator, named the animals and were free from all harm. It rapidly became clear to the scientists and theologians that, if evolution theory was correct, then Adam was no more than a symbol for all of mankind as it evolved in its thousands or millions from its hominid ancestors. It had been a mistake to identify Adam to an individual member of the species. Original Sin, therefore, must refer to the development of man's (or the hominidae's) awareness of right and wrong. In fact, the term, "Universal Sin", now being used, is considered a more accurate description than Original Sin. It follows that Baptism, Redemption and the Immaculate Conception all take on a new meaning.

Perhaps this situation helps to answer the original questions. What is happening? Why does nobody seem to think anything is wrong? Who is wrong, them or us?

A Parallel in Biblical History

Incredible though the situation is, there are parallels in Biblical history. When Moses went up the mountain to receive God's commandments, for example, he was away longer than expected. Long enough for the Hebrew people to lose confidence in him and turn to worshipping idols. Today great numbers of people have lost confidence in his sacred word and replaced it by an unproven scientific theory. The so-called science behind the theory seems to be the idol that is being worshipped. Nobody seems to think anything is wrong, for the simple reason that they believe if science is right the Church must be wrong. No one appears to have weighed the consequences of their belief. First they have assumed that science is right and that evolution is an irrefutable fact. Secondly, those responsible for religious education have, as a result, lost faith in the doc-

trinal teaching of the Church. They consider that those who adhere to this teaching are blind to the facts and by their traditionalism are doing more harm than good. They are clinging to a dogmatic system that has been shown to be in error. In all of this, however, two major facts are overlooked. One is that, by saying infallible doctrines are in error, they are saying that Christ is in error. The other is that science, as it progresses, is now making it clear that evolution theory is not only devoid of empirical evidence but is unscientific. These people who have rejected "ex-cathedra" dogmatic teachings and in consequence should be excluded from the Church, are not only still there, but are teaching the new generation of children and priests to do what they have done !

Truth Can Have Only One Meaning

The singularity of the Catholic Faith, the one element which distinguishes it from any other religion, is its impossibility to interpret God's word in any other way than that proposed by the Holy Spirit to the Church. Protestants may believe that the Holy Spirit guides each person separately in interpreting the Scriptures and thus tolerates different understandings of the same revelation. The Catholic Church instituted by Christ and given into the charge of the Apostles and their successors, recognise that God's word, the truth, cannot have more than one meaning. That meaning, once dogmatically defined by the Church in Christ's name, "He who listens to you, listens to Me" (Luke 10. 16), is incapable of being changed. It is permanent until the end of time. Any deliberate attempt to change it is a direct affront to Christ's divine will and entails "*ipso facto*" eviction from the Church. Despite the terrifying nature of the punishment it is very logical. Christ's command to us to love him with our whole mind, heart and soul allows for no compromise. It requires a total commitment. To contest the "truth" that his word represents could hardly be a clearer way of refusing such total commitment. It is disobedience amounting to rebellion. The consequence, excommunication from the Church is, moreover, far graver than commonly imagined. Cut off from the Church and the Sacraments, the offender jeopardises his eternal salva-

tion. Excommunication originally meant "to hand over to satan". This situation should be a cause of concern to us all. Christ's second commandment allows for no complacency in this matter. We are instructed to love our neighbour as ourselves. If our neighbour through his own fault, negligence or otherwise finds himself outside of the Church, we have a duty before God to help him. No love can be greater than to prevent someone from spending their eternity without God. Our hope as members of the Church is to escape the trials and tribulations of this life and to obtain the unimaginable joy of the beatific vision in the company of the angels and the saints. To do so requires us to want the same thing for our neighbour and to try to help him obtain it. God's command to love our neighbour, however, seems to have been interpreted as some sort of injunction for social reform. Its full dimension of helping those around us to find salvation within the Church is rarely mentioned. Christ's supreme sacrifice upon the Cross at Calvary is the shining example of real love. Love which opened up the gates of heaven, closed since the time of Adam's Original Sin. This is love on the grandest scale which we are commanded to show to our neighbour. There is no lack of opportunities in our present situation to show such love. We are in a veritable battlefield in which we see our fellows being struck down in vast numbers on all sides. They are being decimated, slaughtered mercilessly, simply because they have been stripped of their only effective means of defence. This spiritual carnage will continue unabated until such time as the immense power of God's sacred word is brought to bear upon the enemy. In the beginning was the Word ! Every act of creation was by God's word. The whole of creation continues to be upheld by the power of God's word. The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us. By his word, Christ becomes present on our altars. Christ is the fountain of truth and that truth is conveyed to us through his word. Without that word we have no hope of reaching heaven. The devil knows this and is doing everything within his power to prevent that word from taking root in people's lives. The proof is that countless baptised Catholics have been led to believe that God's word, enshrined in the Church's infallible doctrinal teaching, can be doubted. They are the people who so

badly need our help. Of course, there are all those others who have never been within the Church, whose need is just as great. How can what they have lost be restored to them or how can the others be helped to find what they never had? The short answer is to help them determine the cause of their doubting and to recognise the problem.

Consequences of the Growing Evolutionary Belief

The extensive belief that man evolved from some pre-existing creature has led to a willingness to accept that Adam might not have been the first man from whom the entire human race has descended. There is really no need to go any further than this. The Church's infallible doctrinal teaching, God's word, is quite unequivocal on the matter. It tells us that Adam was the first man, he was immortal and had a supernatural relationship with God. To doubt this teaching is to doubt the revealed word of God. Now, this may sound to many a quite preposterous statement. What has belief in Adam got to do with leading a good Christian life, helping those in distress, loving our neighbour, raising a family and all the beatitudes? Religion is not just a book of laws! Such criticisms would be quite warranted if in doubting the infallible teaching regarding Adam or any other subject, one could continue to lead a good Christian life. Can one live a good Christian having committed a mortal sin? Yes, provided one repents, receives absolution and is thus reunited with God. Clearly if one does not repent, then one is separated from God and is unable to receive any further grace from the sacraments. One can lead a good life but, without grace, even the ability to do good is severely limited. In any case it would not be a Christian life, or more accurately a life with Christ, because mortal sin separates the soul from union with Christ. Disbelief in an infallible doctrine, such as that concerning Adam, is indicative of a certain blindness of soul, because those concerned rarely believe they are wrong and consequently do not even consider repenting. THEY do not realise that their denial of God's teaching exposes them to the danger of losing contact with the life-giving grace so essential to the life of their soul. For them the Catholic Faith as a reality in their lives is seriously

endangered because many of the major doctrines of the Catholic Church are bound up with belief in Adam as the first representative man. Those who deny this will be hard pressed to give a consistent account of other major doctrines such as the redemption by Christ the second Adam, original sin, the necessity of baptism, the immaculate conception.

Church's Moral Teaching the First Casualty

It is fairly certain that if those involved were made aware of the consequences of their beliefs, they could be helped. To make them so aware is an act of love of such far reaching consequences that no effort should be spared in doing so. The first casualty from a disruption in the supply of grace is inevitably the Church's moral teaching. Unless there is a constant and strong supply of grace, a rationalistic approach to morality is adopted. The "do's" and "don'ts" of the Magisterium can be viewed in the light of the norms of an evolving society. The Magisterium is seen as an obstacle to be overcome rather than the kindly guiding word of Christ speaking to us through the Church. It is in these conditions that "Catholics" can justify their acceptance of the media which is in such flagrant opposition to the Church's moral teaching. Without grace, liberalism within the Church, whether it be in the liturgy, the administering of the sacraments, the waiving of Canon Law or disobedience to the wishes of the Holy Father, should be considered as perfectly normal. Where grace has been suspended, where even membership of the Church has been tacitly withdrawn, the people involved, however large their numbers, and even though they may appear outwardly to be Catholics, are deceiving themselves and everybody else. At some point in the past they left the way of truth, not deliberately, of course, but in surrender to a supposedly irrefutable scientific fact. Once off that path, however there was no light to guide them. Without such light there is nothing to stop them plunging ever deeper into the darkness of error.

The awful thing is that not only have they been led away from the Faith, but it is at long last coming to light that they have been misled by the very theory of society in

which they had pinned their faith. As Dr. Michael Denton, a research molecular biologist wrote in 1985: "One might have expected that a theory of such cardinal importance, that literally changed the world, would have been based on something more than metaphysics, something more than a myth" (*Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Burnett Books).

Lucifer is a past master of giving an air of normality to error. By clothing evolutionary philosophy with the respectability of science and disguising liberalism and heresy as renewal, he has obtained results which must have exceeded his wildest expectations

Vital Need for a Rescue Operation

A rescue operation must be mounted and the flood-gates of grace re-opened. Evolution must be revealed for the fraud that it is and the power of God's word restored to his people. The thrust of such an operation should, of course, come from the Catholic schools. Unfortunately, just the reverse is the case. Catholic schools throughout the world have capitulated to evolutionary belief and are teaching the theory as an established scientific fact. The religious instruction in these schools has been adapted accordingly... One school only, to the writer's knowledge, has refused to go along with the herd. Having recognised the lethal effect of evolutionary teaching upon the Faith, it has decided not to ban evolution but rather to examine it in detail and expose its scientific weaknesses. The school science teachers having been "educated" to accept evolution as a scientific fact, have been astonished at the weight of evidence that exists to refute the theory. As a result, the students, contrary to those in other schools, are given access to the scientific evidence both for and against the theory. They are thus receiving a more balanced education and are able to form a judgement in the light of all the facts. It follows that in this school, not only is the Faith taught in its entirety, including the Church's moral teaching, but it is shown not to be at variance with science. The school is St. Patrick's Academy in Westport, Co. Mayo, Ireland. It produces thoroughbred Catholics with sound academic qualifications.

Book Reviews

TRIUMPH AND DISASTER

Fatima Revealed and Discarded by Brother Michel de la Trinité, selected, abridged and translated from the French by Timothy Tindal Robertson; Augustine Publishing Company. Chulmleigh, Devon Ex 18 7HL; pp. 208; £3.50.

This brief volume of 208 pages, is the first of three abridged works, translated from the French of Brother Michael of the Trinity's massive and masterly three-volume work entitled *Toute le Verité sur Fatima*. It is fair to say that Brother Michael's work represents the last word to date on Fatima. The abridged volume under review here has been translated from the French original and published, with Brother Michael's approval, by Timothy Tindal-Robertson, whose Augustine Publishing Co. has done so much for the Faith during the very hard times which the Catholic Church has been going through during the past twenty-five years and which she is continuing to go through at the present time. The highest praise which one can give, perhaps, to Tindal-Robertson's splendid effort is to say that it is worthy of the original. The story it has to tell is not one simply of triumph, but of tragedy as well. The title tells us that — *Fatima Revealed and Discarded*. Many Catholics know of the revealing. No more than a relative handful, I would say, know of the discarding. Perhaps no more than a fraction of that handful perceive the connection between the discarding of Our Lady's message at Fatima and the general apostasy of which the Catholic Church is seized today. No question here of an outright and vicious rejection; simply a drift-away from the Church as no longer of any account in contemporary living. Meaningless now for so many, especially the young, who see so many of its priests and religious as enmeshed in a contemporary secularism, which exercises a dominating and disintegrating influence on the remains of what were once holy lives.

This, if I get the message of this book aright (I have read

it carefully twice) is the tragedy of the discarding of Fatima. The continuing triumph of the first years — from 1917 onwards — climaxed in the Holy Year of 1950. The turning-point came then. Our Lady's call for prayer and penance (understood at Fatima as faithfulness to the daily duties of a truly Catholic life) never "took" as it had done in the early years that followed the original and splendid Revelations to the three children. So few were acquainted with the whole continuing story, particularly as it concerned Lucia, now in a convent after the deaths of her brother and sister. Stimulated by the writings of the Belgian Jesuit, Father Dhanis, with his demotion of what he called Fatima II (the years that followed Fatima's Climax in 1950), the neo-Modernists who supported him succeeded in taking the sheen off what you might call the wider implications of Fatima, bringing indecisiveness, even to Pius XII — to the point where, in the last years, the vision of what the widely spreading devotion to Our Lady's Immaculate Heart might effect, appears to have been clouded in his mind.

As I see it, you have here in this discarding of — better, perhaps, drift-away from — the message of Fatima, no more and no less than a marginalization of the supernatural as relevant to Catholic living. In essence, the message of Fatima called for Catholic lives dominated by devotion to Our Lady's Immaculate Heart, issuing in prayer and penance as the twofold expression of that devotion. In short, the supernatural held high as the only antidote to the secularized naturalism, which was taking hold of so many inside the Church as well as out of it. Inside the Church — particularly where Religious were concerned — manifesting itself in the form of an exaltation of — better perhaps, an overconcentration, however subconscious, on rationalization at the expense of belief. Could it be this that afflicted the thinking of the Belgian Jesuit, Father Dhanis, whose writings, as Brother Michael shows, did so much to downgrade Fatima. Had reason — almost imperceptibly in the case of the Belgian Jesuit, as with so many like himself — come to supplant belief in his mind, so that it could no longer be set where it always must be set for a Catholic and Christian scholar, within the parameters of the Faith? So that his reason, increasingly autonomous now, no

longer "fettered" by the demands of his Catholic Faith, became increasingly the *sole* judge of what Lucia claimed to be the messages she was receiving from the Mother of God. The initial great revelations of Fatima — what Father Dhanis called Fatima I — the Belgian Jesuit accepted. The subsequent messages received by Lucia over the years and transmitted to legitimate Church Authority, were for Father Dhanis no more than children's fantasies, embroidered perhaps, by a child's imagination and expressed in children's words. As such, by no means necessarily credible; therefore unworthy of belief.

I would hesitate to classify the downgrading by Father Dhanis of what he called Fatima II as due to malice on his part or some kind of conspiratorial plotting. I see it myself as the dead-sea fruit of the steady secularization of his own mind, as I have tried to describe it above. Either way the result could only be disastrous. The burgeoning miracle of Fatima was slowed in its tracks to a snail's pace. Devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is in no way now what it was in the glorious years that constituted the immediate aftermath of her first Apparitions to the children. The Five Saturdays in honour of her Immaculate Heart are now, in practice, a rarity. The Feast which Pius XII gave to the whole world at Lucia's request has been relegated in the post-conciliar years to the status of an "optional extra". There is, in fact, a deadness over all that once constituted true devoion — well tried and ancient in its lineage — to Our Mother and Our Queen. She stands rejected and disowned by the apostles of the prevailing secularism, who have no time for her; still less, for her heavenly visitations. These they regard in their pride as a gross, unwarranted and unwanted interference with their own sovereign plans for a man-made Church in a world bound to be better because made in the image not of God, but of that quite appalling creature, "modern man".

There is one answer to this secularized nonsense. It can be understood rightly only in terms of the restoration of the supernatural to its place at the core of Catholic living. That restoration has to be our only goal.

— Paul Crane, S.J.

CAC IN ACTION

The Voice of Christian Affirmation, edited by Avril Smith; Christian Heritage Publications, 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, BN11 4DP; pp. 103 (paperback); £3, post included.

In the early "Sixties" the Catholic convert and apologist, Sir Arnold Lunn, and an Anglican, Mr. Garth Lean, collaborated in two books, *The New Morality* and *The Cult of Softness*, to expose the way in which Christian moral standards were under attack, not least from certain churchmen. In the face of the failure of most Christians to offer effective resistance, Lunn and Lean provided an example of practical ecumenical action in defence of Christian values.

In the last twenty years the attack has become an onslaught with the new ecumenical movement in the van. *The Voice of Christian Affirmation*, comprising thirteen talks given at conferences of the Christian Affirmation Campaign (CAC) between 1975-1986 provides welcome evidence of traditional Christians associating "not in a purely negative opposition to current trends but in a positive affirmation of basic orthodoxy with commitment to its demands".

The CAC was founded in 1974 to warn Christians about the dangers of Christian Marxism and liberal theology. In the foreword, Avril Smith, the wife of Bernard Smith whose book, *The Fraudulent Gospel*, first exposed the Marxist policies of the World Council of Churches, points out that in 1974 it was mainly the modernist liberal churches who were propagating socialism as the only possible political philosophy for Christians. Now in 1987 this social philosophy has spread to include all Christians, with a corresponding breakdown of traditional moral attitudes amongst Christians and the traditional family unit under considerable stress.

The speakers — Anglican, Catholic, Lutheran, Greek Orthodox, Baptist and Methodist — are, as the novelist John Braine puts it, "people who are nominally poles apart . . . and yet . . . get on very well without having the least intention of changing". They range from the well known,

including Hamish Fraser, Michael Davies and Bernard Smith, to the unknown: the talks are all perceptive, lucid, prescient (though the single one that is only in precis form sits rather oddly with the rest).

The issues cover the theological and spiritual, the social and the political. Avril Smith concludes that it is the Socialist philosophy which is distorting our understanding of life itself and that nothing less than reconstruction of the traditional Christian mind can save Christian civilisation. What is meant by the traditional Christian mind and its importance are well demonstrated by this small volume.

— *Michael Macdonald.*

SPOT THE DIFFERENCE : 2

(From the unofficial translation in "Briefings")

6. Bearing in mind the importance and complexity of the problems touched on in this document, I have made the following decisions.

a) A commission is to be established whose task it will be to collaborate with bishops, departments of the Curia and interested parties in order that full communion may be maintained with those priests, seminarians, religious communities or individual religious men and women who so far have attached themselves in some way to the fraternity established by Archbishop Lefebvre but who wish to remain united to the Successor of St. Peter in the Catholic Church, while maintaining their spiritual and liturgical traditions in light of the protocol signed on 5 May by Cardinal Ratzinger and Archbishop Lefebvre.

Study, please, and compare with 1 that follows the Editorial.